```
152
                MR. CERESNEY: Hold on. Why does it
 1
      matter to him? Why -- I mean, I'm just --
 2
 3
      I'm --
                MS. WAXMAN: That's fine. Thank
 4
 5
      you.
                Why does it matter to Ripple Labs
 6
 7
      who created XRP? Why are they stating in
      Exhibit 79 "Ripple did not create XRP"?
 8
                MR. CERESNEY: If you know.
 9
10
                I'll tell you -- I'll tell you what
      I do know to the extent that I know it. We
11
12
      stated simply and factually a long time ago
13
      that the ledger preexisted the company. It
      was one of the conditions of the formation of
14
      the company that we have a functional ledger.
15
16
      Then people, for some reason, just started to
      dispute that. We had no choice but to sort of
17
      defend the position. It just became a point
18
19
      of contention.
20
           0
                Did you ever discuss with anyone
21
      that Ripple did not want to be identified as
22
      the issuers of XRP?
23
                I had a conversation about that with
      Chris Larsen. We were concerned about the von
24
      NotHaus decision, where he was convicted of
25
```

153 1 essentially counterfeiting. And there was a concern that if the company had been the 2 creator or the issuer of the tokens, that that 3 might create liability for the company or the 4 stockholders because they might be deemed 5 counterfeit under federal law. 6 7 That was one of the reasons why it was important to us at the time that the 8 tokens predate the company and that the 9 10 company not be the creator or the issuer of the tokens but a new user of them. 11 12 0 I'm not familiar with that case. 13 Can you tell me more about it? I'll tell you what I recall. And 14 obviously you can look it up and get the 15 precise details. But a man named Bernard von 16 NotHaus was charged essentially with 17 18 counterfeiting. For creating, I think it was 19 the Liberty Dollar or something similar. 20 And a lot of people in the 21 cryptocurrency community -- this case was 22 announced, I think in early or mid-2012. And 23 a lot of people in the cryptocurrency 24 community were concerned because it uses the word coins and -- it was like a matter of 25

```
154
 1
      interpretation. Does that just mean physical
      metal or could that refer to electronic
 2
 3
      tokens? Were these illegal under federal law?
                We didn't want the company or the
 4
      investors to have that risk. And so the
 5
      founders agreed that they would be the ones
 6
      who took on the creation and the issue of the
 7
      tokens and gifting them to the company. And
 8
      that made it a hard requirement that we have a
 9
10
      functional ledger before we could go to
      investors in that second round to sort of
11
12
      create a company. That was the concern at
13
      that time.
                Was there a concern under the
14
      Federal Securities laws?
15
                At that time, I think if you'd asked
16
      us to list all of our concerns, it would have
17
      appeared on the list. But it wasn't -- I
18
19
      would not have characterized it as a
20
      significant concern at the time.
                But it was one of the risks?
21
           0
           A
22
                Yes.
23
                It was one of the risks that -- it
24
      was one of the reasons why you wanted the
      ledger to predate the company?
25
```

```
155
 1
           A
                I don't know that --
                MR. CERESNEY: He -- hold on. He
 2
      didn't say that. But go ahead and answer.
 3
                I don't believe -- I don't think
           A
 4
      we -- I don't think we considered that those
      two things -- I don't have any recollection of
 6
 7
      ever considering them in connection. And I
      don't think we would have at the time. I
 8
      don't think we considered that particular risk
 9
10
      significant enough to warrant that type of --
      that type of step. And I don't recall us ever
11
12
      having advice from counsel to suggest that --
13
                MR. CERESNEY: I --
14
                THE WITNESS: I shouldn't.
                MR. CERESNEY: You shouldn't. Stop.
15
                But I don't believe there was a
16
17
      cause and effect relationship between those
      two things.
18
                Can you just tell me again why --
19
20
      the creation of the ledger -- why it was
21
      important to have the ledger created earlier
22
      on before the formation of the company.
23
                My recollection at the time was that
24
      Chris Larsen and I had a conversation about
      the legal status of the -- legal status of the
25
```

```
156
 1
      tokens. And our primary concern was that the
      tokens might be deemed like counterfeit coins
 2
      under U.S. law. We felt one of the ways to
 3
      mitigate that would be to ensure that the
 4
      company didn't launch until the ledger was
 5
      functional. That's why it was so -- it's one
 6
 7
      of the reasons it was so important to us to
      have a functional ledger and that the tokens
 8
      were issued and distributed prior to the
 9
10
      formation of the company. So that the company
      couldn't be characterized as the creator or
11
12
      issuer of the tokens.
13
                MR. DANIELS: I think you said it
14
      was important to have the tokens issued and
      distributed prior to the formation of the
15
16
      company; is that right?
17
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
18
                MR. DANIELS: In the agreement that
      we are looking at with Arthur Britto, it talks
19
20
      about the anticipated distribution of the
21
      tokens; is that correct?
22
                THE WITNESS: I see it says, "It is
23
      anticipated that a total of a hundred billion
24
      credits shall be recorded on the official
      ledger."
25
```

MR. DANIELS: And this is talking about, at least in the context of Britto, that two percent is going to be distributed to him. At a certain point in the future, there will be a distribution of these tokens; is that right?

need to make the agreement with respect to -with resect to distributions that had already
taken place. I believe the concern with this
was more about subsequent distributions, that
if, for example, the company abandoned the
existing ledger for some reason.

This is about potential subsequent distributions. It could have taken place either -- it could have been executed either before or after the initial distribution. I think either of those are consistent with this. And I don't know from my own knowledge which of those two things were the case.

I don't read the anticipated distribution to mean that it didn't happen yet. Because there would be no need to come up with an agreement about what would happen in something that had already happened. The

```
158
 1
      concern was what would happen in this future.
      So the fact that this talks about subsequent
 2
 3
      distributions may just be that that's what
      Britto was concerned about.
 4
 5
                Again, I'm speculating based on my
      knowledge and the time period and what the
 6
 7
      document says.
 8
                MR. DANIELS: So I guess I'm trying
      to understand.
 9
10
                What type of distribution do you
      think had taken place at the time of this
11
12
      agreement?
13
                MR. CERESNEY: If you know.
14
                THE WITNESS: I don't know.
                                             I know
      they anticipated a distribution where they
15
      would each take from the Genesis account and
16
17
      then they would gift -- each gift eighty
18
      percent of what they had taken to the company.
19
      And I know that this agreement was about
20
      concerns about subsequent distributions. But
      it could have also included --
21
                MR. DANIELS: In the first point
22
23
      here it also says, "The founders agree that
24
      eighty percent of all Ripple credits shall be
      allocated to the company."
25
```

```
159
 1
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
                MR. DANIELS: Is that what you are
 2
 3
      referring to in terms of eighty percents
      distribution to the company?
 4
 5
                THE WITNESS: Yeah.
                MR. DANIELS: That seems like future
 6
 7
      distribution; is that correct?
 8
                THE WITNESS: I don't read it that
 9
      way.
10
                MR. CERESNEY: Bottom line, guys, he
      didn't see this contract at the time. He
11
12
      doesn't -- you are asking him to interpret it.
13
      I mean, I -- you know, at some point, this
14
      goes too far.
15
                THE WITNESS: But honestly, I
      don't -- I don't -- I don't know. I can read
16
17
      this -- I can read this either way. And I
      don't know which way it happened.
18
19
                MR. CERESNEY: We all can read it.
20
                THE WITNESS: You can read "shall"
21
      meaning it's something that's going to happen
22
      subsequently. You can read "shall" as in it
23
      will stay the case and already is. I don't
24
      know.
25
                MR. CERESNEY: I don't think he's
```

```
160
 1
      the witness to tell you.
                Was there any discussion about you
 2
 3
      getting any tokens?
           A
                No, there was not.
 4
                Why not?
           Q
                You would have to ask Jed McCaleb
 6
 7
      that.
                Did you ever ask him?
 8
           0
                I found out about the distribution
 9
      after it occurred. And there were some
10
      discussions that I had with Jed and others
11
12
      about me getting some of the tokens. But it
13
      never happened.
                Did you ask him for some of the
14
15
      tokens?
                There were conversations that I had
16
           A
      with Arthur, Jed and Chris about whether I
17
      would get some of the tokens. But it never
18
19
      happened. I mean, obviously not until much
20
      later.
21
           0
                Was it --
22
                MR. CERESNEY: Hold on.
23
      discussions happened much later, is what you
24
      are saying?
25
                THE WITNESS: Right. Well, both the
```

```
161
      discussions happened and any tokens that I did
 1
      get. You know, the ones that you have, did
 2
      happen later as well.
 3
 4
           Q
                So those initial discussions you are
      talking about, about getting some tokens, when
 6
      did the -- when were the first conversations?
 7
                I -- I believe that would have been
      around -- it would not have been until around
 8
      early 2013. But that -- that's -- I can -- I
 9
      can place in it in time that we were in a
10
11
      Bitcoin conference, I think in San Jose. I
      think it was a 2013 conference. I can't place
12
      it in time better than that.
13
                Did you ask them for XRP tokens?
14
                I did.
15
           A
                How many?
16
           0
                We did not get down to specific
17
           A
18
      numbers.
19
           Q
                Generally? Percentage?
20
           A
                I think -- I think the order of
21
      magnitude might have been something like
22
                            or so. But we didn't
23
      get -- we -- we didn't get to real negotiation
24
      at that time.
25
                What was their response?
           Q
```

162 1 At the time, the company was really 2 focused on other things that it was doing. The response was kind of like this wasn't the 3 4 best time to kind of try to renegotiate. Things didn't happen --6 Did you receive any portion of --7 any XRP in 2013? I -- I don't believe so. I must 8 A have received some because I was able to 9 interact with the ledger. And I couldn't find 10 any records to quantify. But I must have 11 received at least a small amount. Because I 12 13 was able to interact with the ledger, and you can't interact with the ledger without XRP. 14 But I don't have a specific recollection and I 15 wasn't able to locate records. 16 Did you participate in the 17 18 giveaways? A I participated in some of the early 19 20 giveaways. Before the company had a rule 21 prohibiting employees from participating. 22 Outside of the giveaways, were you 23 gifted any XRP. 24 A I have a recollection of a gift of XRP. But I was unable to find a 25

163

```
record of it on the ledger. And it might have
 1
      been on an earlier ledger that was discarded.
 2
      I was unable to confirm that that happened. I
 3
      do have a recollection of it. But I'm not
      sure if it happened -- you know, where in time
      that happened. I couldn't find records.
 6
                If the ledger was discarded. Does
 7
           0
      that mean you don't have access to that XRP?
 8
           A
                     I would still have access to it
 9
      if it was reconstructed on the -- if it was
10
      reconstructed with the other balances it would
11
      have still been mine. So it's possible that I
12
13
      got one million XRP prior to alleged reset.
      Can't find the records because they're in a
14
15
      format that nobody can decode anymore and I
      had them in that initial ledger. That's
16
      possible. Again, I searched for records and
17
      was unable to find them. That would have been
18
                XRP at a time when it was literally
19
20
      worthless.
21
                Going back to Exhibit 77, last
      paragraph. Talks about Xpring.
22
23
                What is the company's, Xpring,
24
      strategy?
25
                It started out as sort of a venture
```

164 1 capital arm to kind of get access to deal flow and see what was going on in space. Possibly 2 3 make some investments in companies that were interested in building things on the XRP 4 Ledger or otherwise inside the cryptocurrency 5 space. It kind of, over time, has evolved into 6 7 more of a technical effort around building products that make it easier for people to 8 interact with technologies like Interledger, 9 10 cryptocurrencies generally and the XRP Ledger. How do those XRP strategies benefit 11 12 Ripple? 13 A So I think there's two main ways. So 14 one of them is investments could directly benefit Ripple because you can invest in a 15 company and the value -- you may be able to 16 17 extract value from the company from either 18 shares or whatever. But I think the -- I 19 think the bigger one is about growing -- about 20 growing the space. 21 I think Ripple's fortunes are tied to the cryptocurrency space pretty tightly. 22 23 So it's more about encouraging development in 24 the space. I think also, initially, there was -- there was a fear that people -- that 25

165 1 the sort of ICO craze might lure people who wanted to build interesting projects into 2 building them on platforms that were not very 3 solid. And lure them into getting locked into 4 a platform that wasn't good technically and it 5 would lead them to fail. This would kind of 6 7 be a way of encouraging them to adopt platforms that were more open, such as in a 8 ledger. 9 10 Does Xpring encourage alternate use cases of XRP outside of payments? 11 12 A That's definitely one of the things 13 that we do. Do you have any involvement with any 14 Xpring initiatives? 15 I do. 16 A What is your involvement? 17 Ethan Beard is the head of Xpring. I 18 A meet with him frequently and several of the 19 20 technical leaders inside the project, and 21 provide assistance with technical decisions 22 that they make in development of the software 23 that they're producing. 24 0 Are they -- is Ripple currently developing software that could use XRP outside 25

```
166
 1
      the payments context?
                MR. CERESNEY: Ripple itself or
 2
 3
      other entities that Ripple --
                MS. WAXMAN: Ripple itself.
 4
                We are developing products --
 5
      software products that would be useful for
 6
 7
      people who are doing that. Like that would
      enable them to more easily access technologies
 8
      like the Ripple ledger and Interledger. So I
 9
      don't think a flat yes or no answer is really
10
      responsive.
11
12
                Can you give me an example of one of
      those products?
13
14
                Yes. One would be what we actually
      call the Xpring platform. Which is
15
      essentially a tool kit for interacting with
16
      technologies like Interledger and the XRP
17
18
      Ledger. That would enable people -- whatever
19
      use case they were pursuing, it would be
20
      easier for them to develop software.
21
                One of the biggest things that we
      heard from the industry people was that people
22
23
      wanted to build on top of blockchain
24
      technologies, but it was very difficult.
      There were only a limited of people with deep
25
```

167 1 expertise in the blockchain space. So if you have to hire ten blockchain experts to do 2 3 anything with blockchain, that tremendously limits the possibility for adoption of 4 technologies like Interledger or the XRP 6 Ledger and even Bitcoin and Ethereum. 7 The idea was to build a sort of layer in the middle that would allow you to 8 interact with a blockchain without having to 9 10 have blockchain expertise. Can you put a native token on the 11 12 XRP Ledger just like if you wanted to issue an 13 ICO token on the Ethereum ledger? 14 A You can. Do people do that? 15 0 16 A Not very much. I've seen it happen, but not very much. They tend to be very 17 18 short-lived. Typically, what you'll see is 19 you'll see XRP, which is like the native 20 token, you'll see assets pegged to either 21 digital assets or fiat issued assets that 22 trade on the decentralized exchange. 23 And then you will see some of these 24 sort of quasi-native issued assets that are kind of digital asset-like that don't live 25

```
168
      anywhere else. I don't believe there have
 1
      been any successful efforts to do that though.
 2
      Nothing stops you from doing it. I just don't
 3
 4
      think people have had particularly much
      interest in doing so.
 6
                Can you turn to page twenty.
 7
                Of which exhibit?
           A
                Of the --
           0
 8
           A
                This one, Exhibit 76?
 9
10
           Q
                Yeah.
           A
                Okay.
11
12
           Q
                The middle post. Post number
13
      forty-five.
14
           A
                Yes.
15
                It talks about founders' XRP getting
           0
      sold.
16
17
           A
                Yes.
                It says, "We definitely have had a
18
19
      problem with founders' XRP getting sold.
20
      We've worked extensively to get that locked
21
      up."
22
           A
                Yes.
23
           Q
                Why would you -- why did you want to
24
      do that?
25
                MR. CERESNEY: Why did you want to
```

169 1 lock up? When you say "do that," you mean to prevent those sales? 2 3 Why did have you want to prevent XRP from getting dumped? 4 MS. WAXMAN: Thank you. There were a variety of reasons. But 6 7 one of them was with a -- if someone had a very -- so Jed had approximately nine billion 8 Which would be enough to sort of 9 10 saturate the ledger with spam for the foreseeable future, to be able to -- remember 11 12 the use case of XRP, back at that early time 13 when this happened, was that it was sort of 14 fuel for your transaction. And the idea was that if you were a 15 16 legitimate user, you would be able to put the actual economic value of your transaction --17 it might be extremely small, it might be a 18 tiny fraction of -- a tiny, tiny fraction of a 19 20 penny, but you could put that into the transaction fee. 21 Whereas, if somebody else had an 22 23 enormous amount of XRP that they had been able 24 to acquire at a very low cost, even if their transactions had much less economic value than 25

```
170
 1
      yours, or none at all, they could produce
      hundreds of millions or even billions of them
 2
 3
      and render the ledger unusable.
                Okay. But would there be another --
 4
           0
      would massive selling have an effect on the
      price of the XRP as well?
 6
 7
           A
                It would. I don't think that was
      the primary concern at the time it happened.
 8
                Was that a concern at all?
 9
           0
10
                I think it probably is fair to say
      it was a concern.
11
12
                Was that a concern to other XRP
13
      purchasers --
                MR. CERESNEY: Hold on.
14
                -- in the market?
15
           0
16
                MR. CERESNEY: So you're asking him
17
      whether other purchasers in the market would
      be concerned?
18
                MS. WAXMAN: Yes.
19
20
                I'm asking that because I know that
           0
      there are lots of comments on a lot of forums
21
      and I know that you participated in a lot of
22
23
      forums.
24
           A
                I did see people who were concerned
      about it at the time, expressing their
25
```

171 1 concern. Jed made a public announcement that he was going to -- I think he probably even 2 3 used the word "dump." That he was going to dump all of his XRP. And certainly there were 4 people who expressed concerned for a variety 5 of reasons. 6 7 Going back to the original question, 0 were you concerned that that selling was going 8 to have a negative impact on the price of XRP? 9 10 At that time, the primary concern was that it would render the XRP Ledger 11 12 essentially useless. But I -- I will say a 13 price -- we were not -- I'm trying to think of 14 a way to precisely describe what happened. The primary concern was the damage 15 16 to the utility of the ledger. There was a 17 secondary concern about the impact on price. That concern about impact to the 18 price, over what period of time was it? 19 20 A I -- I don't recall when Jed made 21 that announcement. It would have been shortly after Jed made that announcement. 22 23 Is there still a concern now that 24 Jed could sell massive amounts of XRP and have 25 a negative impact on price?

```
172
 1
                I believe we've reached a settlement
      with Jed that --
 2
 3
                MR. CERESNEY: Why don't we stop,
      leave it at that. The settlement about his
 4
      sales. That's what you were going to say,
      right?
 6
 7
                THE WITNESS: Right.
                There's no further concern because
           A
 8
      there is a settlement in place.
 9
10
                Is that what you are referring to in
      the first paragraph, "We've worked extensively
11
12
      to get that locked up"?
13
           A
               Yes.
14
                Okay. So you were referring to the
      settlement.
15
                Did the company enter into
16
      settlements are other founders regarding
17
      sales, their sales of XRP? Or anyone else?
18
                I think there was an agreement with
19
20
      Arthur Britto, but I don't know the details.
21
      I seem to remember someone mentioning that
22
      that either existed or was in the works. But
23
      I don't know of anything else.
24
                So the post is accusing Ripple of
      dumping XRP. And then the last paragraph
25
```

```
173
 1
      says, "There were actually two cases where
 2
      we -- where there was attempted dumping that
 3
      you can you could make a reasonable argument
      that we had some responsibility for."
 4
                You are talk about Ripple?
           A
                I believe I am. Yes.
 6
 7
                "And in both cases, we immediately
           Q
      took that XRP off the market and sought
 8
      compensation from the parties."
 9
10
                What two cases are you referring to?
                I'm not absolutely sure what I was
11
12
      referring to. I'm almost positive that one of
13
      them was Jed's initial announcement. The
14
      other one may have been a subsequent act by
      Jed or someone related to Jed. Or something.
15
16
      Someone who Jed had given a large amount of
17
      XRP to. Something in that line. And actually,
      now that I think about it we had sort of
18
19
      more -- "we" is sort of more broad than that.
20
      Because "we" would include also the founders
21
      outside of their capacity. Outside of their
      capacity as, you know, employees of Ripple and
22
23
      people connected with Ripple.
24
           0
                When was the announcement by Jed?
                I do not recall the date.
25
           A
```

```
174
 1
                What did the announcement say?
                My recollection is that Jed
 2
      announced that he was going to dump or sell
 3
      all of his XRP very rapidly.
 4
                Did he say why?
                My -- my recollection is that he
 6
 7
      expressed disillusionment with the project.
      But I don't recall specifically.
 8
                Why was he disillusioned with the
 9
           0
10
      project?
                My -- so the project -- I think it's
11
12
      because we had sort of pivoted away from the
13
      giveaway and grass roots adoption strategy.
                What was the pivot to?
14
                I'm trying to think what that -- I
15
      think that would have been when the pivot was
16
      to do the sort of enterprise payment
17
      international settlement strategy. It might
18
19
      have been earlier than that.
20
           0
                And I don't know if we went over
21
      this, but why did the company pivot to that
      strategy?
22
23
                Giveaways were not -- were not being
24
      effective. And when we went to -- the gateway
      strategy was working successfully with like
25
```

```
175
 1
      cryptocurrency companies and companies that
      were really interested in experimenting with
 2
      new technology just for the sake of
 3
      experimenting with new technology. But when
 4
      we went to companies like financial
      institutions and banks, we got a lot of
 6
 7
      pushback that there wasn't a good fit of the
      tech -- of public blockchain to the use case.
 8
                Was this pivot before or after Brad
 9
           Q
10
      Garlinghouse came on board?
                My recollection is that it was
11
12
      before. But you know what, I might be
13
      thinking before he became CEO rather than
14
      before -- because he initially joined as COO.
      And his role kind of grew in that time. So
15
16
      it's -- I'm pretty sure it was before he
      became CEO. I'm not sure if it was before he
17
      joined the company.
18
19
                What was the timing in relation to
20
      the company's settlement with the DOJ and
21
      FinCEN?
                MR. CERESNEY: Which was in 2015,
22
23
      right?
24
                MS. WAXMAN: Yeah.
                I think we were well into that
25
           A
```

176 1 strategy before the settlement. Because I 2 remember there was concern at the time that the settlement might impact our relationships 3 with partners that we had acquired as part of 4 that sort of enterprise payment strategy. 6 Was Jed disillusioned for any other 7 reason? I would have to speculate about 8 A Jed's motives. Not that he communicated to 9 10 me. What was your relationship with him? 11 12 A It was quite strained at that time. 13 Shortly around that time, he announced Which was sort of a clone of Ripple 14 15 and a competing project that essentially copied all of our -- all the work we had done. 16 I mean, it's a public -- it's open source. He 17 certainly could do that. But I was -- I would 18 19 describe myself as not happy. 20 0 What were -- why did Jed leave Ripple? What were the circumstances in 21 22 connection with his departure? 23 MR. CERESNEY: As you understood it. 24 A From what I saw, Chris and Jed's relationship broke down. There was 25

177 1 disagreement over the direction that the company should go. There was disagreement 2 over whether Chris should remain as CEO. And 3 then the board voted to retain Chris as CEO 4 and essentially to reject some of the 6 suggestions that Jed had made, and he left. Was there a disagreement as to 7 whether the founders should return their XRP? 8 A Not to my knowledge. 9 ever make a public 10 demand or publicly disclose that he had wanted 11 12 the founders to return the XRP to the company? 13 A I do remember him making that 14 statement. Why did -- why does -- does 15 believe that the founders took the XRP from 16 the company? 17 He -- he stated that. I don't know 18 that he believes it. He has stated that he 19 20 believes it, but I find that very difficult to 21 believe. Because I know he was involved in 22 conversations about who -- about precisely 23 about Ronald (sic) von NotHaus issue. 24 It may have been Chris that spoke to him, but I mean, I know that conversation -- I 25

178 1 know those conversations took place. So it just seems odd to me that he would suddenly 2 3 have taken a position that was inconsistent with what I think we understood. 4 The distribution was directly related to that Liberty Dollar case? 6 7 I think that was one of the concerns A that drove the basic parameter that -- it sort 8 of drove the timeline of having to have a 9 10 functional ledger prior to the creation of the company. And having to have the tokens 11 12 functional and distributed prior to the 13 creation of the company. There was also 14 conversation, I think, about whether investors would get tokens. And the idea was that that 15 16 would create liability that -- investors don't want liability. Right. They want 17 participation and the growth of the company. 18 19 That would create liability. It was very 20 clearly decided at the time that just wasn't 21 something that could happen. Are you talking about liability --22 23 was it only liability for perhaps the token 24 being counterfeit or liability in general? I would say our biggest concern was 25 A

```
179
 1
      the counterfeit issue because that was the
      biggest one at the time. I think there were
 2
 3
      other -- I think other major issues included
      consumer protection laws and the possibility
 4
      of state laws that we were not aware of.
                Also to include concern about
 6
      Federal Securities laws?
 7
           A
                I don't believe that that was
 8
      considered a significant concern at that time.
 9
10
      I think if we had made a list of all of our
      concerns, it would have gone on that list. It
11
12
      would not have even gone in the top three.
13
           0
                If you go to page -- hold on one
14
      second -- page five of that, post number ten.
           A
                I see that.
15
16
                My question is, what did the team of
17
      engineers at Ripple Labs do to one, maintain
      the ledger, the XRP Ledger?
18
                We continued to work on improving
19
20
      the functionality, stability and security of
21
      the XRP Ledger software throughout that time
      period.
22
23
                Can you tell me how many engineers
24
      at Ripple are responsible for doing that?
25
                I think it grew from initially
           A
```

180 about -- well, initially it was just me. And 1 it grew to probably about fifteen or sixteen 2 3 now. Can you tell me the experience of 4 0 those engineers and what sorts of background 5 they have? 6 7 It's tremendously varied. All of A them except for -- all of the ones who are 8 actually writing codes, except for one, are 9 primarily C++ developers. And they have a 10 variety of experience, you now, in fields like 11 12 enterprise software development distributed 13 systems, computer security. We've tried to -tried to keep their skill set very varied to 14 make sure that we have expertise in all areas. 15 Do they work on maintaining the XRP 16 17 Ledger full-time? They work on maintaining the XRP 18 Ledger software. Most of them full-time. 19 20 Do they also work on developing the 21 software? They work on -- they work on finding 22 23 bugs, adding new -- designing and adding new 24 features. Quality control and submissions from other people. That kind of thing. 25

Q What new features have been added to the ledger since 2013?

A So there's -- there's obviously a very long, long list of features. I know I'm going to forget some of the big ones.

you to have multiple people who manage an account instead of just one person. So you can have let's say two or three. We added something called "payment channels," which enables people to form transactions off the ledger. So if you want to perform let's say a thousand transactions per second, you don't want all of them to be on the ledger. This lets you have the security of on-ledger transactions without having to submit them all to the ledger.

We have the feature called "checks," which enables you to control how you receive funds. On most cryptocurrency systems, people can just send you money. It sounds like a good thing, but if you have legal obligations to return the funds that you haven't earned, it can be a problem if you receive funds that you didn't want to receive.

182 1 0 Air drops? 2 A Exactly. Similar to that? 3 Q Yeah. I guess that's another 4 A 5 problem. You just get an enormous amount of valueless assets. That you then have to try 6 7 to figure out what to do with them. Are there tax implications? It can be quite a mess. It 8 seems nice to receive money, but it can be a 9 10 burden. Particularly for financial 11 institutions. 12 There were a number of security 13 features that we added in response to various 14 different type things that were defects or they affected usability, performance, 15 security. There was a complete rewrite of the 16 17 payment engine because there were some issues 18 with it, in certain cases, not behaving the 19 way people expected it to. Better 20 instrumentation so that you could tell what it was doing. That kind of thing. 21 22 Did these features improve the speed 23 of the ledger? Some of them -- some of them did. 24 A Did they improve the scalability of 25 Q

```
183
 1
      the ledger?
           A
 2
                Yes.
 3
           Q
                Were they features that were
      developed by Ripple engineers in-house?
 4
                Many of them were.
                Just what is your particular
 6
 7
      involvement in that whole process that you
      just described?
 8
                So initially, I did a significant
 9
      fraction of the coding. Over time that
10
      evolved more into guidance, advice. You know,
11
12
      working on more of the design level and
      technical details. And now it's become much
13
      more sort of hands-off. But you know, when
14
      they have technical questions, they seek me.
15
                When the XRP Ledger was created, was
16
      it decentralized?
17
                When it was first created, no.
18
                Why not?
19
           Q
20
           A
                It had the capability to be run in a
      decentralized way. That was a very important
21
22
      design idea. If you define
23
      decentralization -- people define
24
      decentralization in many different ways. But
      the one that I think is paramount is, does it
25
```

```
184
 1
      have a head that if you cut the head off, the
      organism dies? When you just create something
 2
 3
      and you're the only person who has it and uses
      it, if you go away, so does that thing. It's
 4
      not until it's at least sort of in public
      circulation that other people have an
 6
 7
      opportunity to continue the efforts, that I
      think you can fairly characterize it as
 8
      decentralized.
 9
10
                At what point would you characterize
      a XRP Ledger as decentralized?
11
12
           A
                It's a gradual continuum over time.
13
      I think one -- one -- one place you can put a
14
      stake in the ground is when the -- when the --
      when the -- that's -- it's very tricky to put
15
      a stake in the ground. Obviously if it's not
16
17
      functional, you can't really -- it doesn't
      really do any good to describe it as
18
19
      decentralized. Because what are you
20
      decentralizing? So I think one minimum
      criteria is that it be functional. But after
21
      that, it kind of gets to be a continuum.
22
23
      Where again, it becomes a line drawing
24
      exercise.
                When it was released for the public,
25
```

185 when it became live, was it decentralized 1 then? 2 It wasn't decentralized in the sense 3 that in the short-term, a single party ran the 4 hardware on which the ledger operated. But it was decentralized in the sense that had we 6 7 stopped, somebody else could have taken over. Again, it gets to be a line drawing exercise 8 of what do you think is important to 9 decentralization. And how -- how -- how much 10 does sort of short-term versus long-term 11 12 matter. 13 0 At some point, did the company make 14 it a priority to make the ledger more decentralized? 15 16 A Yes. 17 What did they do? Over a period of time, there were a 18 number of different things that we made. From 19 20 technical changes to the software to make it more resistant to different attack models that 21 might be associated with centralization. To 22 23 try to get more people to run validators. To 24 try to get people to add to the list of validators that they were willing to listen 25

```
186
 1
      to. Validators that weren't run by Ripple
 2
      Labs.
                There were a number of efforts
 3
      related -- that related to sort of improving
 4
      the way people would consider it decentralized
 5
      by various different metrics. I think you
 6
 7
      could even put efforts to reduce the amount of
      XRP we held because some people think that
 8
      distribution is sort of an important parameter
 9
10
      to decentralization.
                How would you reduce the number of
11
12
      XRP that you hold?
13
           A
                Well, the initial strategy was
14
      giveaways. And then later, it became more
      like partnerships. And then sales were part
15
      of that. And that's still sort of a challenge
16
      for us, to figure out how to -- how that's
17
      going to happen.
18
19
                Because you still own quite a bit?
20
           A
                Right. There's no -- there's no
21
      obvious strategy to get that number down in
      any sort of short time frame. Other than just
22
23
      dumping.
24
           0
                Could you give it away?
                It's very difficult. You can, but
25
           A
```

187 1 what happens is that people will tend to try to gain the giveaway to the extent of the 2 3 value of the thing that you give away. If you give something away that's worth \$5.00, 4 someone will spend \$4.50 to try to get it. 5 And we had some bad experiences with giveaways 6 7 after the token had value that resulted in bad actors doing bad things. And it turns out to 8 be a lot more difficult than you might think 9 10 to do that. Is there a benefit to having 11 12 everyone follow Ripple's UNL? 13 The benefit is, is that it saves --14 it saves effort. It's the simplest thing to do. It doesn't require any more effort on 15 16 your part. As long as that gets you the results you want, people will probably do it 17 until it doesn't get them the results they 18 want. And then they may be willing to expend 19 20 effort to do something else. 21 How many validators on the UNL does 0 Ripple control? 22 23 That has changed over time. I think 24 right now, it's five. But I'm -- I'm not sure of the exact number at this time. 25

```
188
 1
                Five out of how many?
                So there's -- I would have to
 2
      double-check the number. But I think there's
 3
      approximately thirty on the UNL that Ripple
 4
      recommends. And there's approximately a
 5
      hundred twenty validators total. Both
 6
 7
      including ones that Ripple recommends and not,
      ones that Ripple does not recommend.
 8
                Is it more likely that the consensus
 9
           0
10
      process will work if they use the recommended
11
      UNL?
12
           A
                It will work as long as there's
13
      substantial agreement on what the UNL is. If
      you think that a significant fraction of
14
      people are following our recommendations, then
15
      it works better if you follow the
16
17
      recommendations at least approximately.
18
      There's a certain amount of sort of wiggle
      room that you get in the protocol where it
19
20
      still works just fine.
                I want to talk about --
21
           0
                MR. CERESNEY: Actually, before you
22
23
      start a new topic, we've been going about an
24
      hour twenty.
                MS. WAXMAN: Sure. That's fine. We
25
```

```
189
 1
      are off the record at 2:57.
                (A brief recess was taken.)
 2
                MS. WAXMAN: We are back on the
 3
      record at 3:09.
 4
                Mr. Schwartz, earlier today we were
      talking about how the company shifted focus,
 6
 7
      they pivoted to using XRP for payments,
      correct?
 8
           A
                Yes.
 9
10
                How did the company set out to
      execute this new strategy?
11
12
           A
                In the first version of that
13
      strategy, the sort of gateway strategy, the
      idea was that the transactions would take
14
      place on the ledger and XRP would provide
15
      liquidity between issued assets. In the later
16
      versions of that strategy, XRP liquidity would
17
      be used to facilitate international
18
      transactions that would primarily -- or the
19
20
      payment itself would take place off the
21
      ledger.
                When was the later version of the
22
           0
23
      strategy?
24
           A
                I would say late 2014, early 2015.
      But it may be a little bit -- it may have been
25
```

```
190
 1
      a little earlier than that.
                And how did the company try to
 2
 3
      execute that later strategy?
           A
                The company started talking
 4
      primarily to banks about how they could use
 5
      public ledger technology to facilitate
 6
 7
      particularly international payments. That's
      where sort of the pain was. We discovered
 8
      that performing the transactions on a public
 9
10
      ledger, was not a good fit for their use case.
      So we started to look at how we could build a
11
12
      payment system that met their requirements,
13
      they could still interface with public
14
      ledgers.
                Did you develop -- did you start to
15
           0
      develop a product that would do that?
16
                Yes. At the time, it was called
17
           A
      Ripple Connect. It's what eventually became
18
19
      xCurrent.
20
           0
                Does xCurrent use XRP?
21
           A
                XCurrent doesn't -- it doesn't care
22
      how the payment is settled. You could use XRP
23
      to settle it, but you don't have to.
24
                If you use XRP, is the product now
      called xRapid?
25
```

```
191
 1
                Yeah -- so the terms did become a
      bit confusing. XRapid was a module that would
 2
      interface with xCurrent as a settlement engine
 3
      that would perform the settlement using XRP.
 4
                When did development of xRapid
      begin?
 6
 7
                My recollection is that it was 2017.
           A
      But I'm not certain.
 8
                Prior to that time, could XRP used
 9
           0
10
      as a settlement only on the ledger?
           A
                That's correct.
11
12
                Were banks using the ledger?
13
           A
                Banks were testing the ledger. They
      weren't actually using it for live payments,
14
      as far as I know.
15
                If you use xRapid for payments, do
16
      the -- does the exchange happen on ledger or
17
      off ledger?
18
                The exchange between XRP and fiats,
19
20
      that takes place off ledger.
                Was that a benefit?
21
           0
                You could see it as a benefit for
22
23
      two reasons. And I think people who -- who
24
      looked at the product did consider it a
      benefit for two primary reasons. One is, at
25
```

192 1 that time, the off-ledger exchanges were somewhat more mature. They were more -- they 2 3 were easier for enterprise customers to use. They had better on ramps and off ramps to the 4 financial system. They had customer service representatives that you could interact with. 6 7 It was a better experience for enterprise 8 customers. I think the other reason was every 9 10 transaction that you make on a public ledger is public. And I think there was a concern at 11 12 that time, I think to some extent still today, 13 that you wouldn't want to reflect every 14 consumer enterprise payment on a public ledger because that would reveal too much information 15 16 about how you were moving money. Was xRapid a way to increase the use 17 of XRP for payments? 18 19 Α Yes. 20 0 Was xRapid geared toward banks? Not really. I think they were 21 A 22 always a potential customer. But I think by 23 the time we implemented -- we always had the 24 vision that banks might use xRapid or something like it. But I think at the time 25

that we developed xRapid, we realized that remission-type flows that would typically be handled by companies like MoneyGram, were a better initial target. And so I think the product was more aimed towards a particular subset of the problem.

Q Why were companies, payments service providers like MoneyGram better suited for the product as opposed to banks?

A There were a variety of reasons. One of them is those payments tend to be smaller. If you imagine remittance payments, they tend to be between, let's say \$300.00 and \$600.00 or so in value. Rather than an enterprise or business to business payment that might be much larger, so you don't need as much liquidity to make it work.

They tend to pay higher rates. Both because the amounts are small and because the corridors have lower volume. So for example, a remittance to Mexico would typically pay a higher fee than let's say a payment between the U.S. dollar and the euro. And also, those companies are very concerned about the cost of their payments.

194 1 Banks typically, unless they're banks that are specifically focused on 2 3 payments, they don't see payments as necessarily core to their business. It's just 4 5 something that customers expect them to do. They're more concerned with things like assets 6 7 under management and loans. And so it's harder to motivate them by saying, "We'll make 8 your payments better." Because that's not as 9 10 core to their business, they don't respond as well to that type of product. 11 So a PSP is more better market fit, 12 13 sounds like? 14 I think we thought if we couldn't succeed with PSPs, we couldn't succeed 15 anywhere. So we would try where we thought 16 the fit was best and see how that went. And 17 we were flexible to update the strategy, you 18 19 know, if that turned out not to be the right 20 decision. 21 When did xRapid first become 0 commercially available? We talked about when 22 23 it was in development. When did it come out 24 of development and actually be used? 25 MR. CERESNEY: Just one thing. We've

```
195
 1
      already determined his recollection of dates
      is not ideal.
 2
                MS. WAXMAN: I actually don't have a
 3
      document that could help here. I wish I did.
 4
                My recollection is late 2018, early
      2019. But it could have been even as much as
 6
 7
      a year before that.
           0
               Actually, I do.
 8
                I know there was a press release in
 9
10
      October of 2018 where the company announced
      that xRapid was commercially adopted.
11
12
          A That seems to fit my recollection
13
      best.
14
               Can you walk us through an xRapid
      transaction?
15
                MR. CERESNEY: Just one thing. He --
16
      we'll see if he can do this. But he's not
17
      really a -- the product quy. He obviously has
18
      lots of knowledge. He may be able to describe
19
20
      this. But you know --
                I'm looking for a very high
21
           Q
      overview.
22
23
           A I can walk you through it
24
      technically. Technically, the payment would
      originate -- there's a lot of variety, but
25
```

I'll pick what I think is the most typical instance. And it's a little more reflective of how the product works now than necessarily how it did in the very early days.

But the general idea is the payment begins on an xCurrent instance. That's sort of the product that a customer would interact with and they would say, "Hey, I want to make a payment." The xCurrent instance then looks for paths that can make that payment. So it looks for routes, which could be direct settlement. It could be something like correspondent banking O.it could be on-demand liquidity from a product like xRapid.

So if you have an xRapid instance that can facilitate that payment, the xRapid instance receives that request for payment and then it tries to determine whether it has the capability to make the time payment. So what it looks at is, do you have enough of that asset that you are spending.

Let's say that you are U.S. dollars to Mexican peso. So do you have enough U.S. dollars at the exchange. Then it looks at the exchange rate between U.S. dollars to XRP. It

197 1 looks at the exchange rate from XRP to Mexican pesos. And the existence of a sort of payout 2 3 ramp. Because once you have the Mexican pesos at the receiving exchange, you need some way 4 to get them to the recipient of the payment. 5 So if all of those pieces are 6 7 available, it then sends a quote back to xCurrent. It says, "I can make this payment 8 and this is how much it's going to cost. This 9 10 is how long it's going to take." It's then up to the individual customer whose xCurrent that 11 is, to decide whether that quote is acceptable 12 13 to them or not. So their integration software would say, "Okay. This payment is going to 14 cost this much. It's going to take this long. 15 Yes, we like that. Or no, we don't like 16 that." 17 If they say, "No, we don't like 18 that, " nothing happens. Not very interesting. 19 20 If they say yes, that message is routed to the 21 xRapid instance and then the xRapid instance initiates the sequence of the events to make 22 23 the payment. 24 It sells XRP at let's say U.S. 25 dollar to XRP exchange. It sends the XRP

198 typically on the ledger to a receiving 1 exchange. The receiving exchange -- it then 2 3 instructs the receiving exchange to make a trade from XRP to Mexican pesos. And then it 4 5 commands either to the exchange or a payout partner to deliver the Mexican pesos to the 6 7 recipient of the payment. Once that's complete, assuming nothing goes wrong, it 8 sends an indication back to the xCurrent 9 10 instance confirming that the payment has taken 11 place. 12 0 How long does it take from the time 13 the customer accepts the quote to the time that the message is sent back to xCurrent? 14 About ninety seconds would be 15 16 typical. It's quite impressive considering the number of discreet events that have to 17 take place. 18 The software runs certain checks to 19 see if you have enough money. 20 21 A A significant fraction --That's the first step, right? 22 23 Yes. A significant fraction of the 24 complexity of developing the product, it's not the case where everything goes right. It's 25

199 1 the large number of things that might go wrong, how each one has a unique recovery 2 3 process to do in that case. When you are building an enterprise product for financial 4 institutions to use, they're very concerned that you cover all of the cases. So the 6 7 technical capability to do all of those things where nothing goes wrong and having a product 8 that people can actually use for that, there's 9 10 an enormous goal. And that was why it took so long to 11 12 develop? 13 A Yeah, that was one of the reasons. I 14 think another big reason was that last mile. Everything is pretty simple to get to the 15 Mexican pesos, let's say in this example. But 16 17 you then need to get the Mexican pesos to the 18 recipient somehow. So there needs to be some 19 entity in Mexico that can make that last mile 20 payment. Assuming that the recipient isn't a bank. 21 22 If it's a remittance -- so that's 23 another interesting sort of downside of the 24 remittance strategy over the enterprise

payment strategy. In the enterprise payment

25

200 1 strategy, the recipient is typically well-connected to our financial system. So 2 just getting the money into a bank is good. 3 Domestic payment systems are usually good 4 enough to get money from any bank to sort of any company in that country. 6 7 If your target is an individual, let's say it's a remittance into Brasil or the 8 Philippines, they may need cash delivered over 9 10 the counter. Or they may have a mobile payment system that isn't well-tied into the 11 12 country's financial system. So I think one of 13 the challenges that we didn't really anticipate when we adopted the sort of 14 remittance strategy was that that last mile 15 would be very complicated. 16 When you are talking about that last 17 mile, you're talking about the actual transfer 18 19 from the exchange that exchanges XRP to Mexico 20 into the local currency and that transfer to the customer? 21 A 22 Correct. 23 Sometimes referred to it as ACH 24 transfer? Well, in the United States, it might 25 A